

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

OLIVIA DUBLIN,
 Plaintiff(s),

Case No. 2:24-cv-02368-NJK

v.

ORDER

EQUIFAX INFORMATION SERVICES,
 LLC, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Pending before the Court is an order to show cause as to Plaintiff's failure to prosecute this case against Defendant Clarity. Docket No. 23. Plaintiff filed a response. Docket No. 24. The response indicates that counsel were discussing settlement, so there would be no effort at default despite Clarity's failure to comply with the deadline to respond to the complaint. *See id.* at 2. The response explains further that Plaintiff anticipated that either a notice of settlement or a request to extend the answer deadline would be filed thereafter. *Id.* The obvious problem here is that parties are not empowered to ignore judicial deadlines without seeking judicial approval. *See, e.g.,* Local Rule 7-1(b).¹ If Plaintiff and Clarity wanted to postpone the answer deadline to discuss settlement, they needed to file a request for that relief months ago. Plaintiff's counsel is **ADMONISHED** for proceeding in a fashion that violates Local Rule 7-1(b). The order to show cause is otherwise **DISCHARGED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 23, 2025


 Nancy J. Koppe
 United States Magistrate Judge

¹ The need for judicial oversight is obvious from the facts of this case. A different defendant filed an answer months ago and discovery is proceeding. Docket Nos. 15, 20. Allowing counsel for other parties to decide without judicial approval to opt out of this process for months on end could result in significant disruption of the case management schedule already entered.